

# Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

09/887,369

Applicant(s)

SUMRALL ET AL.

Examiner

Robert B. Davis

Art Unit

1722

## All Participants:

(1) Robert B. Davis.

(2) Christopher L. Makay.

Status of Application: \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 30 July 2004

Time: 16:30

## Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

## Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

*None.*

Claims discussed:

*1, 14, 36, 44 and 55.*

Prior art documents discussed:

*None.*

## Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

## Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner called Mr. Makay suggesting to delete the incorporation by reference added to the specification after filing and to correct the misspelling "stationer" in claims 1, 14, 36, 44 and 55 in a voicemail. Mr. Makay called the examiner back and agreed to the changes. The examiner stated that the changes would be made by examiner's amendment and the case passed to issue..